

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

BOBBY R. KNOX, JR.,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	1:14CV72
)	
MARION CI DEPARTMENT OF)	
PUBLIC SAFETY,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ORDER AND RECOMMENDATION
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Petitioner, a prisoner of the State of North Carolina, submitted a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for writ of habeas corpus by a person in state custody. For the following reasons, the Petition cannot be further processed.

1. The filing fee was not received, nor was an affidavit to proceed *in forma pauperis* submitted and signed by Petitioner.
2. Petitioner fails to indicate that state court remedies have been exhausted as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b). This Court cannot grant relief unless state court remedies have been exhausted. Id. In North Carolina, a petitioner may satisfy the exhaustion requirement of § 2254 by raising his claim(s) in a direct appeal of his conviction and/or sentence to the North Carolina Court of Appeals followed by a petition to the Supreme Court of North Carolina for discretionary review, or by raising his claims in a Motion for Appropriate Relief ("MAR") and petitioning the North Carolina Court of Appeals for a writ of certiorari if the MAR is denied. See Lassiter v. Lewis, No. 5:11HC2082D, 2012 WL 1965434, at *4-5 (E.D.N.C. May 31, 2012) (unpublished) (citing O'Sullivan v. Boerckel, 526 U.S. 838, 845 (1999), and N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 7A-31, 15A-1422).
3. Petitioner appears to attack the calculation or execution of his sentence instead of the validity of the conviction or sentence. If so, he would need to file under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 instead of § 2254. See, e.g., Youngworth v. United States Parole Commission, 728 F. Supp. 384, 388 (W.D.N.C. 1990). He would

also still need to exhaust any state court or state administrative remedies before doing so and submit an *in forma pauperis* application. Further, he would need to file such an action in the Western District of North Carolina, where he is housed. See Kanai v. McHugh, 638 F.3d 251, 255 (4th Cir. 2011) (citing Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S. 426, 446-47 (2004)).

4. Petitioner has not named his custodian as the respondent. Rule 2, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, requires that the petition name the state officer having custody of the applicant as respondent. The Court takes judicial notice that a proper respondent for North Carolina state prisoners challenging their North Carolina judgment of conviction is the Secretary of Public Safety. Naming the wrong custodian is a common point of confusion, and the Court assumes that Petitioner wishes to name the proper custodian as respondent. Accordingly, unless Petitioner objects within eleven days of the issuance of this Order, the Petition is deemed from this point forward to be amended to name Frank Perry, who is currently the Secretary of Public Safety, as Respondent.

Because of these pleading failures, the Petition should be filed and then dismissed, without prejudice to Petitioner filing a new petition on the proper habeas corpus forms and in the correct district with the \$5.00 filing fee, or a completed application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and otherwise correcting the defects noted. The Court has no authority to toll the statute of limitation, therefore it continues to run, and Petitioner must act quickly if he wishes to pursue this petition. See Spencer v. Sutton, 239 F.3d 626 (4th Cir. 2001). To further aid Petitioner, the Clerk is instructed to send Petitioner a new application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, new § 2254 forms, and instructions for filing a § 2254 petition, which Petitioner should follow if he chooses to file under § 2254. If Petitioner wishes to file a petition under § 2241 in the Western District of North Carolina, he should contact the Clerk of that district and obtain the proper forms. The address is: Room 210, Charles R. Jonas Federal Building, 401 West Trade Street, Charlotte, NC 28202.

In forma pauperis status will be granted for the sole purpose of entering this Order and Recommendation.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that *in forma pauperis* status is granted for the sole purpose of entering this Order and Recommendation. The Clerk is instructed to send Petitioner § 2254 forms, instructions, and a current application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be filed, but then dismissed *sua sponte* without prejudice to Petitioner filing a new petition in the proper district which corrects the defects of the current Petition.

This, the 30th day of January, 2014.


Joe L. Webster
United States Magistrate Judge